Brown & Root Environmental

55 Jonspin Road
Wilmington, MA 01887-1062

Phone: (508) 658-7899
FAX: (508) 658-7870

C-52-12-6-3390W

December 11, 1996

Project Number 5278

Mr. James Shafer
Remedial Project Manager
Northern Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command
10 Industrial Highway, Mail Stop 82
Lester, Pennsylvania 19113

Reference: CLEAN Contract No. N62472-90-D-1298
Contract Task Order 218

Subject: RAB Minutes

Dear Mr. Shafer:

Enclosed is a copy of the final minutes from the November 20, 1996 NETC RAB meeting.

If you have any questions about this matter, please contact me at 508-658-7899.

Very truly yours,

Betsy Horne
Community Relations Specialist

BH:ib

Enclosure

c: Dr. D. K. Abbass
Mr. Alfred Arruda, Jr.
Mr. Robert Belenger
Ms. Elizabeth Bermender
Ms. Mary A. Blake

Dr. David W. Brown
Mr. Paul M. Cormier
Mr. Anthony D'Agnenica
Mr. Francis J. Flanagan
Mr. Mike Foley
Hon. June Gibbs
Mr. Dennis F. Klodner
Mr. Joseph McEnness
Mr. Howard L. Porter
Mr. Paul D. Russell
Mr. Charles Salmond
Mr. Keith Stokes
Mr. John Torgan
Ms. Claudette Weissinger
Mr. Paul Kulpa, DEM
Ms. Kymberlee Keckler, EPA
Ms. Sarah White, EPA
Ms. Jennifer Hayes, Gannett Fleming
Mr. Tim Prior, USF&WS
Mr. Ken Finkelstein, NOAA
Capt. Wyman, NETC
Mr. David Sanders, NETC
Mr. Brad Wheeler, NETC
Ms. Mary Philcox
Capt. Bogle, NETC
Mr. James Barden
Hon. Paul W. Crowley
Mr. Stephen J. Zeitz
Councilman Dennis McCoy
Mr. Vincent Arnold
Captain Norman Pattarozzi
Dr. David Kim
Sister Annie Marie Walsh
Brother Joseph
Newport Public Library
Middletown Free Library
Portsmouth Free Public Library
R. Boucher, NORTHDIV (letter only)
Mr. James Forrelli, B&RE, Wilmington
Mr. John Trepanowski, B&RE, Wayne
Ms. Meg Price, B&RE, Wayne (letter only)
File 5278-3.2 w/o enc./9.4 w/enc.

NAVAL EDUCATION AND TRAINING CENTER
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING
NOVEMBER 20, 1996

MINUTES

On Wednesday, November 20, 1996, the NETC Newport Installation Restoration Program Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) gathered at the NETC Officers' Club for its monthly meeting. The meeting began at 7:12 pm and ended at 8:55 pm.

Eleven of the 18 RAB community members attended: Kathy Abbass, Bob Belenger, Mary Blake, David Brown, Tony D'Agnenica, Joe McEnness, June Gibbs, Howard Porter, Chuck Salmond, John Torgan, and Claudette Weissinger. Also attending were: Paul Kulpa, the RIDEM Remedial Project Manager; Kymberlee Keckler, EPA Remedial Project Manager; Captain Jon Wyman, NETC Navy Co-chair; and Jim Shafer, NORTHDIV Remedial Project Manager. Other personnel attending included: David Sanders, NETC Public Affairs Officer; and Brad Wheeler and Ray Roberge, NETC Environmental Affairs. Community members who provided notice of their absence included: Paul Russell and Keith Stokes. Al Arruda, Liz Bermender, Paul Cormier, Frank Flanagan, and Dennis Klodner were not present.

Agenda items are denoted in the minutes by the underscored headings.

CALL TO ORDER

Joe McEnness, the Community Co-Chair, called the meeting to order and welcomed everyone. He introduced Mike Foley, the newest RAB member. Mike lives in Middletown and has a business in Newport.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Each committee chair reported:

Public Information Committee, chaired by June Gibbs, delivered a written report (attached). The committee has met twice since the last meeting. The focus of the first meeting was to set a date for and to organize the McAllister Point Landfill ribbon-cutting ceremony. The

members also began discussing long-range planning issues. Chuck Salmond suggested involving public school students and volunteered to investigate the matter.

At the second meeting, the committee reviewed the ceremony invitation and list of invitees. On long-range planning, suggestions included developing a RAB link on NETC's existing homepage; approaching groups looking for speakers (Mary Blake will take the lead); developing a standard presentation for RAB speakers; creating a newsletter to send to the mailing list Dave Sanders created for the ceremony; and conducting a few of the RAB meetings in the community rather than at the Officers' Club.

June thought the ceremony was a great success and expressed delight at the attractive condition of the landfill property. Brad suggested that his and another department at NETC had staff that could assist with the website link. It was also suggested that the link offer users a choice of displaying graphics or text only. Dave Brown mentioned the existence of

the Aquidneck Island Computer Club, which might offer to create the link as a challenging project. It was suggested that NUWC could also become a linked site.

Membership Committee Chair, Paul Russell, was out of town. When Joe last spoke to him, he mentioned that a couple of people were interested in becoming new members.

Planning Committee Chair, David Brown, mentioned he and Joe had initiated discussions about how to enable community members to compare sites to each other to assess relative risks. He is also looking for ways to bring the RAB closer to technical discussions.

He passed out fliers announcing that the Aquidneck Island Planning Commission is holding a working session next Saturday to discuss integrated coastal land use. This group is being used as a case study on inter-community cooperation. There is also an effort to ensure that a planned bicycle path connecting Canada to Key West loops through the island.

Project Committee chair, Ray Roberge, mentioned the IR status at two tank farms. Tank Farm 4 tanks are about half way through being cleaned and closed; the cleaning should be completed by the end of November. A decision should be made on how to demolish the tanks by the January meeting. A pilot-scale bioremediation test is underway at Tank Farm 5. More information should be available at the January meeting.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

The discussion of the Ecological Risk Assessments is being postponed to the January meeting because Greg Tracey is attending a national ecological risk meeting.

The McAllister Point Landfill ribbon-cutting ceremony yesterday went well despite poor weather. Approximately 30 people attended the event, sheltered by a tent.

The early action anticipated at the Old Fire Fighting Training Area and a review of the status of the six Formerly Used Defense Sites (FUDS) will be discussed at the January meeting.

Jim Shafer stated that all schedules are on track except for Melville Landfill North, which is the subject of this evening's presentation. Jim reviewed the revised project schedule (handout) for the landfill. As a result of a meeting with the state on October 23, changes were made to the draft work plan (handout). Though the draft does not reflect those changes, the fact sheet (handout) does. A final version of the work plan will be produced to incorporate those changes. The additional site investigation work the state has requested will result in an extension of the site cleanup schedule.

The minutes will include a revised version of the "RAB calendar" showing the Melville date changes (attached). The Melville schedule handed out includes as ID 12 the date of the meeting when we anticipate obtaining the state's blessing on the best alternative to employ at Melville. Hopefully, the only other factor that could make this schedule slip further would be bad weather.

A pump and treat system, with extraction wells and a treatment plant, is operating at Tank Farm 5. We plan to discuss a change to this process at the January meeting. The wells are extracting clean water and the plant is treating clean water, not the plume that the system was constructed to address. Brown & Root will be in the field collecting data from monitoring wells at Tank Farm 5 before the next meeting so we can re-evaluate the system.

Another issue the RAB needs to discuss is whether it makes sense to continue to meet on the third Wednesday of each month. The "RAB calendar" was created to help identify the dates on which the board would be receiving deliverables and form the basis of determining when meetings might be scheduled to discuss these deliverables. For instance, the next deliverable on the calendar is the Derecktor draft final ERA report, to be released the end of December. Jim suggested the RAB meeting to discuss this document should be scheduled to coincide with the time when all the regulatory comments have been received, so the RAB can participate in evaluating the entire range of issues. After some discussion about the wisdom of changing the established RAB meeting schedule, a consensus developed to retain that schedule. Joe recommended that the RAB be given at least 10 days notice for special, deliverable schedule-driven meetings, but that the RAB would continue to meet on the third Wednesday of each month.

Comment: Is the system at Tank Farm 5 the same as at Tank Farm 4?
Response: No. The tanks at Tank Farm 4 are being cleaned internally.

Comment: Why does the problem at Tank Farm 5 exist? Is it because of a lack of understanding of groundwater flow direction, a design flaw, or insufficient information on which to make an informed decision?
Response: The situation is probably a result of a bit of both. The pump and treat system was based on the best information available at the time. We need to gather new data from monitoring wells at Tank Farm 5. Based on that data, we should be able to determine what changes are necessary to the existing pump and treat system.

Comment: The librarians at the information repositories should probably be alerted that a series of fact sheets, starting with Melville, will be forthcoming. They could be encouraged to place them in a separate binder. Otherwise, they will be lost in the torrent of paper.
Response: Kevin Coyle, who works for Brad, is building a looseleaf notebook that will include the fact sheets.

Brad raised the issue of RAB attendance as observers at technical meetings (public representatives of the three communities attended meetings of the Technical Review Committee, the RAB's predecessor). These technical meetings focus on evaluating data and making decisions about sites. At the January meeting we will draw up a list of community members who are interested in attending the technical meetings.

Comment: How often do these technical meetings occur?
Response: They are scheduled on an as-needed basis so there would be plenty of advance notice. Jim noted that technical meeting dates are included as individual ID tasks on the extended site schedules. Kymberlee noted that dates for some of them have already been changed and that often the meetings can last all day.

PRESENTATION

Jim Forrelli, the Melville Landfill North project manager from Brown & Root, gave a presentation on the work plan amendment for the site, accompanied by his colleague Steve Parker. Jim indicated he would address the site investigation process, the landfill's

background, site features, the objectives of the study, and the field work necessary to support a cleanup decision. He began his presentation by showing overhead graphics of the site shown within with the NETC Newport complex and of the site itself with major features highlighted (same graphic as in the fact sheet).

IR site studies typically follow the CERCLA process (overhead); Jim emphasized that since this site was not included as part of EPA's National Priorities List, its cleanup will be guided by State of Rhode Island regulations. RIDEM is the enforcement lead at the site. A site investigation report will be produced.

The landfill was used from World War II to 1955 as the repository of refuse such as acids, waste paints, solvents, waste oils, and PCBs. However, the quantity of waste placed in the approximately 7-acre landfill is not well known. Aerial photographs show lagoons in the landfill low-lying area, which is within the 100-year floodplain. A marsh is present to the north and a drainage ditch exists along the north-central railroad right of way.

The 1983 Initial Assessment Study and 1986 Confirmation Study revealed the existence of oil and oily sludge. In 1992, a Phase I RI was conducted (when it was thought the site would be reviewed under the CERCLA process) that recommended additional activities should be conducted. Removal activities were undertaken in 1993 and 1995. As a result of information uncovered in the removal actions, a work plan was prepared in 1995 to oversee collection of additional data. The activities that are the subject of tonight's presentation are additions to that work plan.

The objectives of the work are to: complete determining the nature and extent of contamination, identify groundwater impacts, quantify near-shore impacts, assess threats to human health, and evaluate remedial cleanup alternatives. The field activities will focus on six areas: Stockpile Areas "A" and "B", Areas "S" and "N", suspected lagoons, and a former oily waste pile.

The field activities scheduled are similar to those you will be hearing about at most IR sites, so in addition to explaining Melville-specific plans, the presentation will provide information about how and why certain field activities are conducted that you can use in reviewing other sites. These activities include:

- wetlands delineation. The delineation has been completed. Translating that information to a map will begin this week.

- passive soil surveying. This is a technique used to identify VOC hot spots. Brown & Root will deploy absorbing material (material passed around the room) in various locations 3 feet below ground for 3 weeks. Laboratory analysis of the material can track relative levels of chemicals in the soil gas. We should have results approximately a week later.

Comment: How do you determine where to place the material?
Response: We will establish a grid system, focusing on areas we know the least about. Analytical results will determine the kind of gas present and its relative amounts. From that information, we can identify potential hot spots.

- surface soil sampling. We use a hand auger (auger shown) to collect soils from the surface to 24-inch level.

- test pit excavation. Excavating equipment (picture shown) will dig rectangular holes in both the six areas of concern as well as across the site. A study of the excavations will

help to inventory the landfill as well as collect soil samples. Any groundwater that appears in the pits will also be sampled.

Comment: You mentioned the presence of lagoons. Are these ocean tidal lagoons?
Response: No. These are man-made areas created to hold waste.

Comment: Are these lagoons where dredge material from the bay off Melville was deposited?
Response: No. Not to my knowledge.

Comment: To what level must Melville be cleaned up?
Response: That will be determined by the future use of the site as well as the level of human health risk the site poses. We understand the site is slated to contain a marina, a parking lot, and a bath house. Since no human health assessment has been conducted, we don't yet know what cleanup levels will be required by the state.

Brad mentioned that Melville Marine will determine what will be constructed on site based on compliance with the risk remedy.

Comment: Is this site near the boat launching area?
Response: Yes. It is just to the south of the landfill.

Comment: I am concerned about destroying wetlands to create this complex.
Response: Wetlands are usually located in areas where impermeable soil lies below the surface. The wetlands at this site extend intermittently for approximately one-quarter mile.

Comment: Is there any sort of monitoring requirement for the complex?
Response: The CRMC, Corps of Engineers, and RIDEM have all approved the project. It is, however, subject to jurisdiction by the Portsmouth Planning Board, which has required them to install the boat launching area before beginning construction of the 1200 slips.

- soil borings. Drilling cores will help determine the vertical extent and types of contaminants in the landfill.

- monitoring wells. Wells permit groundwater sampling, which helps determine if a plume has been created, how big it is, and in which direction is it flowing. (passed around a picture of a drill rig as well as a well screen).

- hydraulic conductivity test. They help determine hydrogeologic characteristics.

- tidal influence study. Compares the level of water in monitoring wells against the levels in the bay to determine possible tidal influences on groundwater at the site.

- investigation-derived waste. IDW is comprised of the soil waste cuttings and water generated during the study, as well as the field equipment and clothing used during the study that cannot be reused. These materials need to be disposed properly.

Comment: Was a baseline investigation conducted? Has groundwater been impacted by the landfill?

Response: Previous studies were conducted in 1983, 1986, and 1992. Those investigations did not result in a sufficient number of data points to determine what the impact to groundwater has been.

Comment: How are groundwater samples collected?

Response: Traditionally, groundwater samples were collected with bailers (bailer passed around). However, recently EPA has identified another technique, low-flow sampling, as a more accurate method; it is the one we will be using at Melville. Low flow involves pumping water out of the well (and thus drawing groundwater outside the well into it) so slowly that you obtain a representative sample of the groundwater when collecting samples. The low-flow technique prevents sediment from being resuspended so none enters the sample. Contaminants adhering to sediment particles can skew the results of the laboratory sample.

- free product search. We will be looking for free product, that is, pockets of contamination floating ON the groundwater. The heavier contaminants, such as chlorinated solvents, tend to sink, so we would look for free product in bedrock.

Comment: Are we certain that all the contamination at Melville resulted from Navy activities?

Response: Whether or not all the material in the landfill was generated by the Navy, the Navy is taking responsibility for the cleanup. There could have been many contributors. We will be installing background wells to the east; th old Portsmouth landfill is just to the east of Melville. Although Ted Hood owns the property, it may have been a blessing that the Navy retained cleanup jurisdiction. Otherwise, we could have ended up a responsible party in someone else's cleanup effort and would have been considered a "deep pocket"; we would have lost all control over the cleanup decisions and costs.

Steve Parker explained that different sets of bottles are used to collect water and soil samples, and that each set includes containers of different sizes, colors, and fabrication (plastic and glass). The numbers of bottles needed is driven by the type of contaminant the laboratory is being asked to look for. Also, since a sampler has to ensure that the well is stable before collecting the sample, it can take a full day to obtain a sample from one well.

Comment: Why are the slots so small on the screen? Can the groundwater actually get through these holes?

Response: Yes, quite freely, in fact. In wells with a 10-foot screen, groundwater can flow into the well at a rate of 10 to 15 gallons per minute.

Steve also touched on the quality control requirements for sampling. A duplicate is collected for every tenth sample. If great variability in the results exists, it shows something is wrong, either in the sampling technique, the laboratory analysis, or the location of the well or pit.

Comment: Do you assume groundwater will attain a stable level?

Response: No. It is dynamic. In fact, it can fluxuate up and down the screen several inches. That is why one of the first things we do when commencing field work is check the water table.

Comment: Could these fluxuations be caused by environmental factors?
Response: W n ed to record an array of factors that can influence the water: pH, turbidity, conductivity, temperature, and salinity.

Comment: Can you take enough samples to ensure no outside influence?
Response: It is difficult. That is why we establish background sampling locations.

Comment: What about quality control procedures for the laboratories to which you send samples for analysis?
Response: Laboratories establish their own procedures and forward their QC details (like the results of spikes) to us with the analytical results. Spikes are water samples containing a known amount of contaminant. The samples are checked to determine the accuracy of laboratory analysis. A spike is sent with every twentieth sample.

If the samples are being shipped to a laboratory or will be sent by courier, we send a trip blank (clean water) along in the cooler. If the analysis of the blank reveals anything other than clean water, we know some "bleeding" has occurred in the cooler on route so analytical results of other samples in that cooler would be judged suspect. This form of contamination does not occur often but glass is porous. If you were to write on a glass bottle with a Sharpie pen, you would find traces of the ink inside the bottle.

Comment: How does the Melville project relate to the brownfields studies?
Response: Those projects require a different level of testing. Of course, the objective we seek to is ensure that our data is legally defensible should our cleanup be challenged. Paul Kulpa emphasized that the state is treating the Navy just as it does any other entity involved with hazardous waste cleanups.

Comment: Do you conduct any statistical analyses on your data?
Response: Yes. We look at the relative difference between blanks and spikes. Our data undergo rigorous validation procedures.

Our sample coolers also undergo a chain-of-custody process. As the samples are collected, they are placed in coolers that are packed in dry ice; each cooler is accompanied by a chain-of-custody form, which each person that handles the cooler must sign. We also need to ensure that the samples are analyzed within a specific time period. If volatile organics are not analyzed relatively quickly after they are collected, the analytical results will not accurately reflect the contamination level in the original sample.

Comment: What is a volatile organic compound?
Response: It is part of a class of compounds that evaporates easily, like dry cleaning fluid and gasoline. Semi-volatile compounds are heavier and emit an acrid smell. Examples include tar, asphalt, and creosote.

Comment: Do you ever test for biological contamination?
Response: No, not unless there is an indication we should do so. More often we will test organisms for chemicals to determine if contamination has entered them through their environment.

Comment: I heard a hospital existed at Melville sometime during the 19th century. Do you know where it was?

Response: Apparently it was used to treat civil war troops. There was also a grav yard nearby.

Comment: Based on the earlier studies at Melville, how do levels there compare to the contaminant levels found at Derecktor Shipyard?

Response: It is difficult to compare the two sites. Each contains different types of contaminants found in different types of locations. The types of contaminants found at Derecktor are more mobile. Kymberlee recommended that the agenda for the next RAB meeting include a discussion of the Relative Risk Ranking process and its results for NETC. It would help the RAB better understand how these sites compare with one another.

Comment: When you are conducting the work at Melville, you should warn your excavators about possible dangers in any dredge spoils placed in the landfill. People who have been inside the Hood yard near dredge spoil piles have actually seen ordnance uncovered after a hard rain eroded the piles.

Response: Our health and safety plan for the site will address this possibility.

NEXT RAB MEETING

The next RAB meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, January 15. The agenda items discussed include:

- completing the discussion on the draft ERAs for Derecktor Shipyard and McAllister Landfill and beginning the discussion of the draft final ERA for Derecktor.
- discussing demolition of tanks at Tank Farm 4 and the bioremediation test at Tank Farm 5, as well as altering the pump and treat system at Tank Farm 5.
- developing a list of RAB members who will attend technical meetings.

RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD

Public Information Committee

The Subcommittee held two meetings -

First meeting:

Attendees: Mary Blake, Chuck Salmond, Claudette Weissinger, Kevin Coyle and Ray Roberge from Brad Wheeler's office, Betsey Horn, David Sanders', NETC Public Affairs Officer, and June Gibbs, Chair.

The discussion centered mainly on setting a date and planning for the Ribbon Cutting at McAllister's Point.

Long range plans were discussed for ways to inform the community about the Restoration Activities.

Chuck Salmond suggested we try to involve students from the public schools. He agreed to research the possibilities and report back.

The group agreed to meet again on October 30th to finalize plans for ribbon cutting at which time David Sanders would have a proposed letter to send out inviting people and a list of potential invitees.

We agreed to bring in further suggestions for long range plans.

Second meeting:

Same attendees as the first meeting except that Chuck Salmond was out of town.

We reviewed the list and letter which Dave Sanders prepared and agreed that there would be included with the letter a flyer to emphasize the date and time. I assume you all received one.

Suggestions were discussed for publicizing the work of the RAB and informing the community of the restoration being done.

Some of the suggestions were:

*Including a page in the NETC Web Site - as soon as a new computer expert is on board.

*Approaching various civic groups who need speakers. Mary Blake has agreed to compile a list of such groups.

*It was agreed that we should work out a standard presentation with visual aids so our members might feel more comfortable going out.

*Creating a newsletter to be sent to those on the mailing list we developed for the ribbon cutting whenever there was something to report.

*Schedule a few of our meetings out in the community when issues of general interest were to be discussed.

The Ribbon Cutting at McAllister's Point November 19 was a success in spite of the rain. Over 30 people attended. Speakers were Capt. Wyman, Timothy Keeney, Director of RI DEM and Joe McInnis.

RAB REVIEW DATES CALENDAR

START REVIEW DATE	ACTIVITY	COMPLETE REVIEW DATE
JANUARY 13, 1997	DERECKTOR DRAFT FINAL ERA REPORT	FEBRUARY 22, 1997
JANUARY 29, 1997	DERECKTOR DRAFT SASE	MARCH 14, 1997
APRIL 17, 1997	MCALLISTER REVISED DRAFT FINAL RI REPORT	MAY 31, 1997
JUNE 13, 1997	DERECKTOR DRAFT FINAL SASE	JULY 12, 1997
JULY 1, 1997	MELVILLE NORTH LANDFILL FINAL SI REPORT	JULY 31, 1997
AUGUST 7, 1997	MELVILLE NORTH LANDFILL REMEDIAL ALTERNATIVE PLANNING MEETING	
OCTOBER 13, 1997	MCALLISTER DRAFT FS REPORT	NOVEMBER 27, 1997
NOVEMBER 10, 1997	MELVILLE NORTH LANDFILL DRAFT FS	DECEMBER 24, 1997
FEBRUARY 26, 1998	MCALLISTER DRAFT FINAL FS REPORT	MARCH 27, 1998
MARCH 29, 1998	MELVILLE NORTH LANDFILL DRAFT FINAL FS	APRIL 27, 1998
FALL 1998	MCALLISTER PRAP/PUBLIC MEETING	
WINTER 1998-1999	MELVILLE NORTH LANDFILL PRAP/PUBLIC MEETING	

December 11, 1998